



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,080	07/30/2003	Adam G. Hanes	1449/5	8470
25297 7.	590 03/01/2005		EXAM	INER
JENKINS & WILSON, PA 3100 TOWER BLVD			PETERSON, KENNETH E	
SUITE 1400	22,2		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DURHAM, N	C 27707		3724	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/630,080	HANES ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kenneth E Peterson	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this communic	cation appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communion. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum states of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum states of the period for reply within the set or extended peri	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repunication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty tutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI will, by statute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on <i>14 February 2005</i> .					
· <u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
· <u> </u>						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	·					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8,9,12-14,16,23,25,27 a</u> 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ar 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8,9,12-14,16,23,25,27 a</u> 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restrict	e withdrawn from consideration. and 30 is/are rejected.)n.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objec	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
2. Certified copies of the priority of	documents have been received. documents have been received in Ap of the priority documents have been r hal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	 -	(070.440)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8jan04</u>. 	ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/630,080 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

1. Applicant election of claims 1-5,8,9,12-14,16,23,25,27 and 30 is noted. Applicant has cancelled all non-elected claims.

2. Claims 5,8,12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5, the term "hollow sleeve member" has no basis in the specification, and thus it is not clear what is being referred to.

In claim 8, the term "the sleeve" has no proper antecedent basis in the claims or specification, and thus it is not clear what is being referred to.

In claim 12, the phrase "for rotatably driving a cutting element" is an intended use statement, thus the "cutting element" is considered to be not positively claimed.

However, later in claim 12 is the phrase "first outer wall circumscribes at least a portion of the cutting element", which may lead some to believe that the "cutting element" is positively claimed. Currently it is not clear whether or not the "cutting element" is positively claimed or merely an intended use. Note that claim 1 only refers to a cutter in intended use statements, and thus it is clear that the cutter is not part of the claimed invention. Also note claim 23, which does positively claim a cutter.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/630,080 Page 3

Art Unit: 3724

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- 4. Claims 1,2,5,12-14,16,23,25,27 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Byrne '126, who shows a head assembly having a 1st lateral wall (e.g. 35 or 16 or 48 or 55), a 1st transverse shield wall (e.g. 20 or 34 etc.), a 2nd lateral wall (7) having an annular gap filed by a hollow sleeve member or adaptor member (10), a shaft (2) and a cutter (6) having an annular rim (5).
- 5. Claims 1,2,5,8,12-14,16,23,25,27 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schlessmann '934, who shows a head assembly having a 1st lateral wall (e.g. 13), a 1st transverse shield wall (e.g. 19), a 2nd lateral wall (e.g. 46) having an annular gap filed by a hollow sleeve member or adaptor member (e.g. 17), a coaxial adaptor wall (18), a shaft (e.g. 15) and a cutter (23) having an annular rim (22).
- 6. Claims 1,2,5,8,12-14,16,23,25,27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lill '165, who shows a head assembly having a 1st lateral wall (e.g. 43), a 1st transverse shield wall (39), a 2nd lateral wall (vertical sidewalls of 12) having an annular gap filed by a hollow sleeve member or adaptor member (21 or 22,22), a coaxial adaptor wall (23 or 24), a shaft (e.g. 15 or 16) and a cutter (28) having an annular rim (19).
- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3724

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5,8,9,12-14,16,23,25,27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lill '165.

Lill, as set forth above, shows most of the recited limitations.

In regards to claim 3, Lill's 1st and 2nd lateral walls are attached to the same transverse shield wall (39) instead of being attached to two integral transverse shield walls. However, there is no structural difference between a single transverse shield walls and two transverse shield walls that are integral with one another. The courts have long ruled that "the unity or diversity of parts would depend more on the choice of the manufacturer, and the convenience and availability of the machines and tools.....than on any inventive concept". See In re Lockhart, 90 USPQ 214.

Furthermore, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to employ one or two parts in situations such as this. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have employed two integral transverse shield walls on Lill, instead of just one transverse shield wall, since the courts have ruled this to be obvious and because it is an old equivalent known for the same purpose.

In regards to claims 4 and 9, the bearings 22,22 have a hollow cylindrical portion, a first annular adaptor plate (bottom of 22) and presumably a second annular adaptor plate (top of 22). Since the second annular adaptor plate is not explicitly drawn, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to have such annular adaptor plates

Application/Control Number: 10/630,080

Art Unit: 3724

at the lateral ends of bushing for the purpose of preventing axial sliding. An example of

this is the bottom annular adaptor plate on Lill's 22. If it wasn't there already, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have added a top annular adaptor

plate to Lill's adaptor 22 for the purpose of preventing axial sliding.

9. Made of record but not relied on are patents showing pertinent shaft shields.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson at 571-272-4512, on Monday-Thursday,

7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached at 571-272-4514. In lieu of mailing, it is

encouraged that papers be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the

PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov or call the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kp

February 23, 2005

KENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5